arXiv:1608.06571v1 [math.CA] 23 Aug 2016

CONTROL OF PSEUDODIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS BY MAXIMAL FUNCTIONS VIA WEIGHTED INEQUALITIES

DAVID BELTRAN

Abstract. We establish general weighted L^2 inequalities for pseudodifferential operators associated to the Hörmander symbol classes $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$. Such inequalities provide optimal control of these operators by geometrically-defined maximal functions, which involve fractional averages associated with certain "non-tangential" approach regions. Our results constitute a non-translation-invariant version of certain Fourier multiplier estimates obtained previously by Bennett and the author.

1. Introduction

Given a smooth function $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the associated pseudo-differential operator T_a by

$$T_a f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{ix\cdot\xi} a(x,\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi) d\xi,$$

where $f \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\widehat{f}$ denotes the Fourier transform of f. The smooth function a is typically referred to as the *symbol*, and throughout the rest of the paper, we will assume that a belongs to the symbol classes $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ introduced by Hörmander in [19]; recall that $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ consists of all $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the differential inequalities

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma a(x,\xi)| \lesssim (1+|\xi|)^{m-\rho|\sigma|+\delta|\nu|} \tag{1}$$

for all multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, where $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leqslant \delta, \rho \leqslant 1$.[1]

The study of pseudodifferential operators was initiated by Kohn and Nirenberg [20] and Hörmander [19], and it has played a central role in the theory of partial differential equations. The L^p-boundedness of these operators has been extensively studied, see for instance the work of Calderón and Vaillancourt [6] for the L^2-boundedness of the classes $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$, with $0 \leqslant \rho < 1$, or Hörmander [19], Fefferman [16] or Stein [33] for L^p bounds for the symbol classes $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$. Weighted L^p-boundedness in the context of Muckenhoupt classes has also been studied, see for example the work of Miller [27], Chanillo and Torchinsky [10], or the most recent work of Michalowski, Rule and Staubach [25, 26]; we shall refer back to them later.

In this paper we are interested in establishing weighted inequalities valid for any admissible weight w. More precisely, given a symbol $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, our goal is to identify a geometrically-defined maximal operator $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \mathcal{M} w$$

holds for any non-negative weight $w \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Of course the validity of such an inequality may be asked for any operator. This has received considerable interest over the last few decades, starting with the work of Fefferman and Stein [17] for the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function M, in which the controlling maximal function is M itself. In the context of Calderón–Zymgund operators, this question has been addressed by Córdoba and Fefferman [13], Wilson

Date: August 24, 2016.

Key words and phrases. Symbol classes; Pseudodifferential operators; Weighted inequalities; Maximal operators.

This work was supported by the European Research Council [grant number 307617].

[1] We use the notation $A \lesssim B$ to denote that there is a constant C such that $A \leqslant CB$. The implicit constant will always be independent of the weight w. We also omit the constant factors of π coming from our normalisation of the Fourier transform.

[34] and Pérez [29], where $\mathcal{M}$ is a minor variant of M. A similar result has been recently proved by the author [1] for the Carleson operator, combining some of the ideas developed by Pérez in [30] with the recent developments connecting Calderón–Zygmund theory with sparse operators; see for instance the work of Lerner [23, 24], Di Plinio and Lerner [15] or Lacey [21].

However, in this paper we are more motivated by a conjectural example in an oscillatory setting. In the late 1970s, Stein [32] raised the possibility that the disc multiplier might be controlled via a general weighted L^2 inequality by some variant of the universal maximal function

$$\mathcal{N}w(x) := \sup_{T \ni x} \frac{1}{|T|} \int_T w;$$

here the supremum is taken over all rectangles T containing the point x. This conjecture is still very much open for $d \geqslant 2$, although positive results were obtained in the case of radial weights by Carbery, Romera and Soria [8]. A similar question was also raised by Córdoba [12] in the more general context of the Bochner–Riesz multipliers. For further progress concerning this conjecture we refer the interested reader to the work of Carbery [7], Christ [11], Carbery and Seeger [9], Bennett, Carbery, Soria and Vargas [4] or Lee, Rogers and Seeger [22]; see also Córdoba and Rogers [14] for a weighted inequality in a related oscillatory context.

It is well known that the kernel associated to the disc multiplier is highly oscillatory, and also far from being integrable for $d \geqslant 2$. Motivated by the above conjecture of Stein, Bennett and Harrison studied weighted inequalities for certain oscillatory kernels on the real line. Bennett [3] took later a Fourier multiplier perspective on such questions on the real line, which was generalised to higher dimensions by Bennett and the author in [2]. In particular, they established (among other things) that given $0 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 1, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, if $m : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfies the differential inequalities

$$|D^\sigma m(\xi)| \lesssim (1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta - (1-\alpha)|\sigma|} \tag{2}$$

for all multi-indices $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ such that $|\sigma| \leqslant \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + 1$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_m f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta} M^4 w. \tag{3}$$

Here

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta} w(x) := \sup_{(y,r) \in \Gamma_\alpha(x)} \frac{1}{|B(y,r)|^{1-2\beta/d}} \int_{B(y,r)} w$$

and

$$\Gamma_\alpha(x) := \{(y,r) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,1) : |y - x| \leqslant r^{1-\alpha}\}, \tag{4}$$

and M^k denotes the k-fold composition of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function M with itself.[2]

The maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}$ may be interpreted as a fractional Hardy–Littlewood maximal function associated with the approach region Γ_α, which is a "truncated" standard cone in the classical case $\alpha = 0$, and allows a certain order of tangential approach when $0 < \alpha < 1$. In this latter case, the maximal functions $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta}$ are closely-related to those considered by Nagel and Stein [28] in a different context. We refer to [3] and [2] for a richer discussion on the maximal operators and the approach regions.

Of course if a symbol $a(x,\xi)$ is x-independent, T_a is a multiplier operator. In particular, if a multiplier m satisfies the differential inequalities (2) for any multi-index $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, then $m \in S^{-\beta}_{1-\alpha,0}$ for $0 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 1$. Obvious model examples are the classical multipliers $m_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) = e^{i|\xi|^\alpha}(1 + |\xi|^2)^{-\beta/2}$. A natural question that arises from the work in [2] is to determine if an inequality like (3) could hold for T_a when $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, with controlling maximal function $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{1-\rho,-m}$; observe that this would constitute a non-translation invariant version of some of the results in [2]. This paper is devoted to giving a positive answer to this question. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, where $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leqslant \delta \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$, $\delta < 1$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w \tag{5}$$

[2]Similar results were established for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, although this will not be relevant in this paper. We refer the interested reader to [2].

for any weight w, where

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}w(x) := \sup_{(y,r)\in\Lambda_\rho(x)} \frac{1}{|B(y,r)|^{1+2m/d}} \int_{B(y,r)} w$$

and

$$\Lambda_\rho(x) := \{(y,r) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,1) : |y-x| \leqslant r^\rho\}.$$

Observe that our theorem covers the full range of admissible values for m, ρ, δ except for an endpoint case corresponding to the symbol classes $S^m_{1,1}$. This is to be expected, as it is well known that there are symbols in the class $S^0_{1,1}$ that fail to be bounded on L^2, and thus (5) would fail on taking $w \equiv 1$.

Our approach to proving Theorem 1 differs from the one adopted in [2] for the multiplier case, although some of the main ideas are still present. As is to be expected, the case of pseudodifferential operators adds complexity, and more delicate arguments seem to be required. In particular, appropriate applications of the symbolic calculus and the Cotlar–Stein almost orthogonality principle play important roles. We refer to Section 2 for a discussion of different possible approaches to the problem, together with an outline of our proof.

For ease of notation we have introduced in Theorem 1 the maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$; note that $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} = \mathcal{M}_{1-\rho,-m}$. These operators are significant improvements of some variants of the Hardy–Littlewood maximal function. In particular, a crude application of Hölder's inequality in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$ reveals the pointwise estimate

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}w \leqslant (Mw^s)^{1/s}$$

when $2sm = (\rho-1)d$, for any $s \geqslant 1$. On the level of Lebesgue space bounds, it was shown in [2] that the maximal operators $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$ are bounded on L^s, for $s > 1$, when $2sm = (\rho-1)d$, a property that the maximal functions $(Mw^s)^{1/s}$ do not enjoy. These observations allow us to reconcile Theorem 1 with existing results in the context of weighted A_p theory. In particular, for $s = 1$ one may obtain the following.

Corollary 2. *Let $a \in S^{-d(1-\rho)/2}_{\rho,\delta}$, where $0 \leqslant \delta \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$, $\delta < 1$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^8 w. \tag{6}$$

This allow us to recover the L^2-case of a result of Chanillo and Torchinksy [10], and Michalowski, Rule and Staubach [25], in which it is established that the symbol classes $S^{-d(1-\rho)/2}_{\rho,\delta}$, with $0 < \rho < 1$, are bounded on $L^p(w)$ for $w \in A_{p/2}$ and $2 \leqslant p < \infty$. The inequalities (6) improve on the existing two-weighted inequalities with controlling maximal function $(Mw^s)^{1/s}$, which are implicit in the works [10, 25] from the elementary observation that $(Mw^s)^{1/s} \in A_1$ for any $s > 1$. We remark that in the case of the standard symbol class $S^0 := S^0_{1,0}$ and the classes $S^0_{1,\delta}$, with $\delta < 1$, the inequality (6) holds with maximal operator M^3; this is a consequence of a result of Pérez [29] for Calderón–Zygmund operators.

Finally, we would like to comment on the optimality of the maximal operator $\mathcal{M} = M^2\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}M^5$ in (5). An elementary duality argument and an application of Hölder's inequality reveal that if $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, where $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leqslant \delta \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$, $\delta < 1$, the inequality (5) implies

$$\|T_a\|_{p\to q} \lesssim \|\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}\|^{1/2}_{(q/2)'\to(p/2)'}.$$

This allows us to transfer $L^p - L^q$ bounds for $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$ to bounds for T_a; in particular the optimal bounds for the maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$ allow one to recover the optimal bounds for the symbol classes $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$. We refer to [2] for further discussion on the Lebesgue space bounds for $\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m}$ and their optimality, which allows us to recover, for instance, the L^p-boundedness of T_a for $2 \leqslant p < \infty$ under the condition $m \leqslant -d(1-\rho)|1/p - 1/2|$; see Stein [33] for a review of the bounds on the symbol classes. We note that the number of compositions of M in (5) and (6) does not need to be sharp here; we do not concern ourselves with such finer points in this paper.

Structure of the paper. The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we discuss different strategies for attacking the problem, providing an outline of the proof of Theorem 1. Section 3 contains some

preliminary results to which we will appeal in the proof of Theorem 1. In Section 4 we give a detailed proof of our main result, which relies on auxiliary results proved in Sections 5 and 6. Some appendices are included at the end of this paper for completeness.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank his supervisor Jon Bennett for stimulating conversations and valuable comments on the exposition of this paper. He also thanks Alessio Martini for an interesting discussion.

2. Proof strategies

The aim of this section is to give an outline of the proof of Theorem 1. As is mentioned in the previous section, Bennett and the author proved in [2] a very similar result for Fourier multipliers. The approach used in that case seems no longer appropriate in the case of pseudodifferential operators. However, we consider it instructive to briefly recall the argument in the multiplier case as it provides some insight for the strategy we use for pseudodifferential operators.

2.1. The multiplier case.

The method used in [2] to prove weighted inequalities for Fourier multipliers was the Stein *g-function* approach [31]. On a very general level, this consists of identifying two auxiliary operators g_1 and g_2 satisfying the *pointwise* estimate

$$g_1(T_m f)(x) \lesssim g_2(f)(x).$$

Once such an estimate is established, norm estimates for the operator T_m can be deduced from norm estimates for the auxiliary operators g_1 and g_2.

Given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, Bennett and the author introduced in [2] the square function

$$g_{\alpha,\beta}(f)(x) := \Big(\int_{\Gamma_\alpha(x)} |f * \phi_t(y)|^2 \frac{dy}{t^{(1-\alpha)d+2\beta}} \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/2},$$

where ϕ is a smooth function with Fourier support contained in $\{|\xi| \sim 1\}$, and $\phi_t(x) := t^{-d}\phi(x/t)$ for $t > 0$; we note that Γ_α in (4) may be defined for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, see [2] for further details. In this paper we are only concerned with the cases $0 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 1$, so we assume such values of α in the rest of this discussion. Consider also the minor variant

$$g^*_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda}(f)(x) = \Big(\int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f * \phi_t(y)|^2 (1 + |x-y|/t^{1-\alpha})^{-d\lambda} \frac{dy}{t^{(1-\alpha)d+2\beta}} \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/2},$$

which is a pointwise majorant of $g_{\alpha,\beta}$. For m being a Fourier multiplier satisfying the differential inequalities (2), it was established in [2] that

$$g_{\alpha,\beta}(T_m f)(x) \lesssim g^*_{\alpha,0,\lambda}(f)(x), \tag{7}$$

for a certain $\lambda > 1$, which together with appropriate weighted inequalities for the $g_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $g^*_{\alpha,0,\lambda}$ led to (3).

The concept of an α-*subdyadic* ball was crucial in the analysis in [2]. We say that a euclidean ball B in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is α-*subdyadic* if $\operatorname{dist}(B,0) \geqslant 1$ and

$$r(B) \sim \operatorname{dist}(B,0)^{1-\alpha},$$

where $r(B)$ denotes the radius of B. Observe that for $\alpha > 0$, typically $r(B) \ll \operatorname{dist}(B,0)$, making it natural to refer to such balls as subdyadic. The prototypical example of a decomposition of the space $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \geqslant 1\}$ into α-subdyadic balls is to decompose the space into dyadic annuli $A_k := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \sim 2^k\}$ and cover each A_k by a family of $O(2^{\alpha d k})$ balls of radius $O(2^{k(1-\alpha)})$ with bounded overlap.[3] This two-stage decomposition example is implicitly used in the theory of pseudodifferential operators, as it may be extracted from Stein [33]. We refer to [2] for a more detailed description of the subdyadic decomposition, which has its roots in the sequence of papers [4, 5, 3].

[3] Observe that the case $\alpha = 0$ reduces to the case of a standard decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into dyadic balls.

The reason to decompose the frequency space into subdyadic balls is that the multipliers m satisfying the differential inequalities (2) are effectively constant on such balls. A manifestation of that principle is that it is possible to prove, with rather elementary techniques, that if B is an α-subdyadic ball and f_B is a function Fourier supported in B (or in a slightly enlargement of B) then

$$g^*_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda}(T_m f_B)(x) \lesssim g^*_{\alpha,0,\lambda}(f_B)(x), \tag{8}$$

with constant independent of the ball B.

The more general pointwise estimate (7) follows from (8) on observing that the square functions $g_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $g^*_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda}$ "decouple" and "recouple" such subdyadic frequency decompositions for $\lambda > 1$. To be more precise, if $\mathcal{B}$ is a family of α-subdyadic balls B with bounded overlap supporting a partition of unity $\{\widehat{\psi}_B\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$ on $\{|\xi| \geqslant 1\}$, then

$$g_{\alpha,\beta}\Big(\sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} f * \psi_B\Big)(x)^2 \lesssim \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} g^*_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda}(f*\psi_B)(x)^2 \lesssim g^*_{\alpha,\beta,\lambda}\Big(\sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} f*\psi_B\Big)(x)^2. \tag{9}$$

As $\{\widehat{\psi}_B\}_{B\in\mathcal{B}}$ is a partition of unity, $T_m f = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{B}} T_m f * \psi_B$, and as T_m is a translation-invariant operator we may write $T_m f * \psi_B = T_m(f*\psi_B)$ and make use of the localised estimate (8).

Observe that the convolution structure of the operator T_m has been crucial in the above analysis, and more precisely the key fact that the frequency variable of f and $T_m f$ is the same. This property is not preserved by pseudodifferential operators; however the similarity of the differential inequalities (1) satisfied by a symbol a to those satisfied by the multipliers m (see (2)) suggests a decomposition of the ξ-space, where ξ corresponds to the frequency variable of f, into $(1-\rho)$-subdyadic balls. The decoupling estimate (9) does not seem to be effective any longer in this setting when applied to $T_a f$, and we appear to be unable to easily adapt this g-function approach to the context of pseudoffierential operators.

2.2. **The symbol classes case.** Despite the apparent failure of the above approach, it is important to observe the following property from the proof of the decoupling estimate (9) in [2]. Let B, B' be α-subdyadic balls with $r(B) \sim r(B')$ and let f_B, $f_{B'}$ be functions whose Fourier support lies in B and B' respectively. Let $\widetilde{w}$ be a weight function with Fourier support lying in a ball centered at the origin of radius $r(B) \sim r(B')$. Then, Parseval's theorem reveals the orthogonality property

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_B \overline{f_{B'}} \widetilde{w} = 0$$

if $\operatorname{dist}(B, B') \gtrsim r(B)$. For the same reasons exposed above, this orthogonality remains valid for $T_m f_B$ and $T_m f_{B'}$, but not for $T_a f_B$ and $T_a f_{B'}$. However, the key idea is that despite $T_a f_B$ and $T_a f_{B'}$ not being orthogonal with respect to the weight $\widetilde{w}$, their contribution to the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sum_{r(B)\sim r(B')} T_a f_B|^2 \widetilde{w}$$

will be very small if $\operatorname{dist}(B, B') \gtrsim r(B)$. This may be seen as a certain almost orthogonality property between the pieces T_{a_B} and $T_{a_{B'}}$, and for this reason it will suffice to make use of the Cotlar–Stein almost orthogonality principle.

The previous ideas require us to find a suitable weight $\widetilde{w}$ controlling an essentially arbitrary weight w. Our mechanism to construct such a weight $\widetilde{w}$ will only be effective to obtain almost orthogonality properties between $T_a f_B$ and $T_a f_{B'}$ if B and B' are subdyadic balls satisfying $r(B) \sim r(B')$. As subdyadic balls lying on a dyadic annulus enjoy that property, a first Littlewood–Paley type reduction for the problem seems suitable. This allows us to control w by a suitably band-limited weight $\widetilde{w}$ in each dyadic annulus. In contrast to the multiplier case, weighted Littlewood–Paley theory will not suffice for our purposes, and a quantitative version of the *symbolic calculus* will be needed.

Observe that an α-subdyadic decomposition is only suitable in $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \geqslant 1\}$. This may be easily overcome, as a symbol $a(x,\xi)$ satisfying the differential inequalities (1) behaves differently in the regions $\{|\xi| \leqslant 1\}$ and $\{|\xi| \geqslant 1\}$. Observe that the differential inequalities (1) on $\{|\xi| \leqslant 1\}$ become

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma a(x,\xi)| \lesssim 1$$

for all multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$. When a is supported in $\{|\xi| \leqslant 1\}$, these will suffice to deduce an appropriate two-weighted inequality for T_a by elementary means.

3. Preliminaries

The aim of this section is to provide the reader with some standard results, or minor variants of them, to which we will appeal in the proof of Theorem 1.

3.1. Weighted Littlewood–Paley theory.

Here we present forward and reverse L^2 weighted inequalities for a dyadic square function of Littlewood–Paley type. We will use this to reduce the proof of Theorem 1 to the class of functions whose Fourier support lies in a dyadic annulus.

Let $P : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{P}) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : 3/4 \leqslant |\xi| \leqslant 3\}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let P_k be defined by $\widehat{P}_k(\xi) = \widehat{P}(2^{-k}\xi)$ and let Δ_k be the operator given by

$$\widehat{\Delta_k f}(\xi) = \widehat{P}_k(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi).$$

The following forward estimate follows from a more general result of Wilson [35]; see also [5, 3, 2] for similar formulations of the statement.

Proposition 3 ([35, 5, 3, 2])**.**

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\Delta_k f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M w.$$

The reverse estimate is slightly less standard, and corresponds to a d-dimensional version of a result in [5]; we also refer to [2] for a similar argument in the case of a continuous d-dimensional square function. Here we assume that the functions $\{\widehat{P}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ define a partition of unity, that is

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{P}(2^{-k}\xi) = 1.$$

Proposition 4 ([5, 2])**.**

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\Delta_k f|^2 M^3 w.$$

3.2. Composition of a frequency cut-off with a pseudodifferential operator.

The composition structure of pseudodifferential operators has been extensively studied; we refer to the work of Hörmander [19] in the case of the symbol classes $S^m_{\rho,\delta}$. We require the following quantitative version when the outermost symbol is a cut-off function on the frequency space adapted to a dyadic annulus.

Theorem 5. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{\varphi}) \subseteq \{|\xi| \sim 1\}$ and given $R > 1$, let φ_R be defined by $\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi) := \widehat{\varphi}(R^{-1}\xi)$. Let $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, where $0 \leqslant \delta \leqslant \rho$ and $\delta < 1$. Then, there exists a symbol $c \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ such that*

$$T_c = T_{\widehat{\varphi}_R} \circ T_a.$$

Moreover, for $\epsilon \geqslant 0$ and $\kappa > 0$, the symbol

$$e^N := c - \sum_{|\gamma|<N} \frac{i^{-|\gamma|}}{\gamma!} \partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{\varphi}_R \partial_x^\gamma a \in S^{m-N(1-\delta)+d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}_{\rho,\delta}$$

for all $N > \frac{d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}{1-\delta}$, and satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma e^N(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-N(1-\delta)+d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon-|\sigma|\rho+|\nu|\delta} \tag{10}$$

for any multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$.

This very specific version of the more general symbolic calculus in [19] allows us to obtain quantitative control for the differential inequalities satisfied by the error term e^N in terms of R, which corresponds to the scale of the frequency projection φ_R. The implicit constants in (10) depend on finitely many C^k norms of $\widehat{\varphi}$ and on the implicit constants in the differential inequalities (1) satisfied by a, and they will be acceptable for our purposes for being independent of the parameter R.

We remark that the order of the error symbol e^N in Theorem 5 is not necessarily sharp here, but one may choose N sufficiently large so that e^N has sufficiently large negative order. Modulo such an error term, we may understand the composition of φ_R with a pseudodifferential operator as the action of the pseudodifferential operator itself, and some other pseudodifferential operators of lower order, on functions with frequency support on the dyadic annulus $\{|\xi| \sim R\}$. We provide the proof of Theorem 5 in Appendix B for completeness, which consists of a careful modification of the symbolic calculus developed in [33] for the standard symbol classes S^m.

3.3. **The kernel of a pseudodifferential operator.** A pseudodifferential operator with symbol of sufficiently negative order is to all intents and purposes a convolution operator with an integrable kernel. This is an easy consequence of the following observation in Hörmander [19]. Let $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$, $m \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leqslant \delta, \rho \leqslant 1$, $\delta < 1$ and let $K(x,y)$ denote the distribution kernel of T_a. Then if $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$ satisfies $m - |\gamma|\rho < -d$, the distribution $(x-y)^\gamma K(x,y)$ coincides with a function,

$$(x-y)^\gamma K(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi} (-iD_\xi)^\gamma a(x,\xi) d\xi. \tag{11}$$

In view of the differential inequalities (1), this quickly allows us to deduce that if a symbol $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ has sufficiently negative order, that is, $m < -d$, then

$$|K(x,y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{L/2}}$$

for any $L \geqslant 0$. In particular, taking $L > d$, one may control the pseudodifferential operator T_a by a convolution operator with an integrable kernel.

This elementary observation will be very useful to handle the pseudodifferential operator associated with the error symbol e^N obtained after an application of Theorem 5. In view of the differential inequalities (10) satisfied by e^N, the identity (11) reveals that if N is chosen such that $m - N(1-\delta) + d\delta + \kappa\delta + \epsilon < -d$ then the kernel K_{e^N} associated to the symbol e^N satisfies

$$|K_{e^N}(x,y)| \lesssim \frac{R^{-\epsilon}}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{L/2}} \tag{12}$$

for any $L \geqslant 0$. As in (10), the implicit constant here is independent of R, and only depends on finitely many C^k norms of $\widehat{\varphi}$ and on the implicit constants in the differential inequalities (1) satisfied by a. Taking $L > d$, this allows us to bound T_{e^N} by an integrable convolution kernel with a quantitative control of the constant in terms of the scale of the frequency projection φ_R. As we shall see in Section 4, such quantitative control is required for summability purposes in the proof of Theorem 1.

3.4. **Almost orthogonality.** The proof of Theorem 9 relies on an application of the Cotlar–Stein almost orthogonality principle.

Lemma 6 (Cotlar–Stein, [33] p. 280)**.** *Let $\{T_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a family of operators and $T = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} T_j$. Let $\{c(j)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a family of positive constants such that*

$$A = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} c(j) < \infty$$

and assume that

$$\|T_i^* T_j\|_{2\to 2} \leqslant c(i-j)^2,$$
$$\|T_i T_j^*\|_{2\to 2} \leqslant c(i-j)^2.$$

Then

$$\|T\|_{2\to 2} \leqslant A.$$

3.5. **L^2-boundedness of integral operators.** We also require the following standard version of the Schur test, which is a simple consequence of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality; see for example Theorem 5.2 in [18].

Lemma 7 (Schur's test, [18])**.** *Suppose T is given by*

$$Tf(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(x,z) f(z) dz$$

and assume there exist measurable functions $h_1, h_2 > 0$ and positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |K(x,z)| h_1(z) dz \leqslant C_1 h_2(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |K(x,z)| h_2(x) dx \leqslant C_2 h_1(z).$$

Then

$$\|T\|_{2\to 2} \leqslant (C_1 C_2)^{1/2}.$$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

Let $a \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ with $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leqslant \delta \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$, $\delta < 1$. By the embeddings of the symbol classes is enough to prove Theorem 1 for $a \in S^m_{\rho,\rho}$ with $0 \leqslant \rho < 1$, and $a \in S^m_{1,\delta}$ with $\delta < 1$. Observe that the upcoming Theorem 9 is also valid for the symbol classes $S^m_{1,\delta}$ with $\delta < 1$, as they are embedded in $S^m_{1,1}$.

As discussed in Section 2, a symbol a satisfying the differential inequalities (1) behaves differently in the regions $\{|\xi| \leqslant 1\}$ and $\{|\xi| \geqslant 1\}$. Let $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a smooth function supported in $|\xi| \leqslant 2$ and let $a_0(x,\xi) = a(x,\xi)\eta(\xi)$ and a_1 be such that $a = a_0 + a_1$. Theorem 1 will follow from establishing the required weighted inequalities for both T_{a_0} and T_{a_1}.

In view of (1), the symbol a_0 satisfies the differential inequalities

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma a_0(x,\xi)| \lesssim 1$$

for all multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$. This, together with the support condition on the variable ξ that we just imposed in $a_0(x,\xi)$, leads to the following rather elementary weighted inequality.

Proposition 8.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{a_0} f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 A_1^* w.$$

where $A_1^* w := \sup_{r \geqslant 1} A_r$ and

$$A_r w(x) := \frac{1}{|B(x,r)|} \int_{B(x,r)} w.$$

We provide a proof of this proposition in Section 5. The inequality (5) for T_{a_0} follows from noting that

$$A_1^* w \lesssim A_1 A_1^* w \lesssim \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} A_1^* w \lesssim \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M w \lesssim M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w.$$

The difficulty relies thus on understanding the operator T_{a_1}. We will reduce the proof of Theorem 1 to the following theorem, which corresponds to an analogous statement but over the class of functions whose Fourier support lies in a dyadic annulus.

Theorem 9. *Let $a \in S^m_{\rho,\rho}$, where $0 \leqslant \rho \leqslant 1$. Let f be a function such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f}) \subseteq \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \sim R\}$, where $R \geqslant 1$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M \mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,R} w$$

uniformly in $R \geqslant 1$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,R} w(x) := R^{2m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\sup_{|y-z| \leqslant R^{-\rho}} w(z) \Big) \frac{R^{\rho d}}{(1 + R^{2\rho}|x-y|^2)^{N_0/2}} dy$$

and N_0 is any natural number satisfying $N_0 > d$.

We postpone to Section 6 the proof of this theorem, which involves the two-stage decomposition briefly described in Section 2.

The reduction to Theorem 9 is done as follows. A first application of Proposition 4 to the function $T_{a_1} f$ gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{a_1} f|^2 w \lesssim \sum_{k \geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k (T_{a_1} f)|^2 M^3 w.$$

Let Φ be a smooth function such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{\Phi}) = 1$ in $\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\eta| \leqslant 3\}$ and define Φ_k by $\widehat{\Phi}_k(\eta) = \widehat{\Phi}(2^{-k}\eta)$ for any $k \geqslant 0$. As $\widehat{\Delta_k g}(\eta) = \widehat{P}(2^{-k}\eta)\widehat{g}(\eta)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{P}) \subseteq \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d : 3/4 \leqslant |\eta| \leqslant 3\}$, we have $\Delta_k(T_{a_1} f) = \Delta_k(T_{a_1} f) * \Phi_k$. An application of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Fubini's theorem gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k (T_{a_1} f)|^2 M^3 w = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k (T_{a_1} f) * \Phi_k|^2 M^3 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k (T_{a_1} f)|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w, \tag{13}$$

uniformly in $k \geqslant 0$, as the functions Φ_k are normalised on $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

At this stage, one would like to interchange Δ_k and T_{a_1} in order to apply Theorem 9. As discussed in Section 3.2, this may be done provided we introduce terms of lower order. As $\delta < 1$, fixing $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$, an application of Theorem 5 for any $k \geqslant 0$ gives

$$\Delta_k (T_{a_1} f) = T_{a_1} (\Delta_k f) + \sum_{1 \leqslant |\gamma| < N} \frac{i^{-|\gamma|}}{\gamma!} T_k^\gamma f + T_{e_k} f,$$

where

$$T_k^\gamma f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{ix\cdot\xi} \partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{P}_k(\xi) \partial_x^\gamma a_1(x,\xi) \widehat{f}(\xi),$$

and e_k is a symbol satisfying

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma e_k(x,\xi)| \lesssim 2^{-k\epsilon} (1 + |\xi|)^{m - N(1-\delta) + d\delta + \kappa\delta + \epsilon - |\sigma|\rho + |\nu|\delta}$$

for any multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Here $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, and we choose N to be a positive integer satisfying

$$m - N(1-\delta) + d\delta + \kappa\delta + \epsilon < -d;$$

for ease of notation we removed the dependence of N in the error term e_k, as N is a chosen fixed number independent of k. Such a choice of N allows one to argue as in Section 3.3, and the inequality (12) reads here as

$$|K_{e_k}(x,y)| \lesssim \frac{2^{-k\epsilon}}{(1 + |x-y|^2)^{L/2}}$$

for any $L \geqslant 0$. Taking $L > d$, and setting $\Psi^{(L)}(x) := (1+|x|^2)^{-L/2}$, an application of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Fubini's theorem gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{e_k} f|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim 2^{-2k\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \Psi^{(L)} * |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim 2^{-2k\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w,$$

with implicit constant independent of $k \geqslant 0$; the last inequality follows from the observation that

$$\Psi^{(L)} * |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim A_1^* M^4 w \lesssim A_1 A_1^* M^4 w \lesssim \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} A_1^* M^4 w \lesssim M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w.$$

This is an acceptable bound for each T_{e_k}, as summing over all $k \geqslant 0$ we obtain

$$\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{e_k} f|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim \sum_{k \geqslant 0} 2^{-2k\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

For the term corresponding to $T_{a_1}(\Delta_k f)$, we invoke Theorem 9,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{a_1}(\Delta_k f)|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k f|^2 M \mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,2^k}(|\Phi_k| * M^3 w) \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k f|^2 M \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^4 w,$$

where the last inequality follows by taking the supremum over all $k \geqslant 0$ in the weight function. Now, one may recouple the dyadic frequency pieces using the standard weighted Littlewood–Paley theory from Proposition 3,

$$\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Delta_k f|^2 M \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^4 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2 \mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w.$$

Finally, we need to study the terms T_k^γ for $1 \leqslant |\gamma| < N$. Observe that $\partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{P}_k$ is supported on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : 3/4 \cdot 2^k \leqslant |\xi| \leqslant 3 \cdot 2^k\}$ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, so we are still able to use Theorem 9 here. To this end, let θ be a smooth function such that $\widehat{\theta}(\xi) = 1$ on $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : 3/4 \leqslant |\xi| \leqslant 3\}$ and that vanishes outside $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : 1/2 \leqslant |\xi| \leqslant 4\}$. Let Θ_k be the operator defined by $\widehat{\Theta_k g}(\xi) = \widehat{\theta}_k(\xi)\widehat{g}(\xi)$, where $\widehat{\theta}_k(\xi) = \widehat{\theta}(2^{-k}\xi)$. Then $T_k^\gamma f = T_k^\gamma(\Theta_k f)$ and observing that the symbol $\partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{P}_k(\xi)\partial_x^\gamma a_1(x,\xi) \in S^m_{\rho,\delta}$ uniformly in $k \geqslant 0$ (by embedding of symbol classes), Theorem 9 leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_k^\gamma f|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_k^\gamma(\Theta_k f)|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Theta_k f|^2 M\mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,2^k}(|\Phi_k| * M^3 w),$$

uniformly in $k \geqslant 0$, for every γ such that $1 \leqslant |\gamma| < N$. The sum in γ is not a problem as there is a finite number of terms in that sum, so

$$\sum_{k\geqslant 0} \sum_{1\leqslant|\gamma|\leqslant N} \frac{1}{\gamma!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_k^\gamma f|^2 |\Phi_k| * M^3 w \lesssim \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Theta_k f|^2 M\mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,2^k}(|\Phi_k| * M^3 w).$$

For the sum in k we use again standard weighted Littlewood–Paley theory (Proposition 3) to conclude that

$$\sum_{k\geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Theta_k f|^2 M\mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,2^k}(|\Phi_k| * M^3 w) \leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Theta_k f|^2 M\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w,$$

where the first inequality follows from taking the supremum in $k \geqslant 0$ in the weight function. Putting the pieces together, we have shown that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{a_1} f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 M^2\mathcal{M}_{\rho,m} M^5 w,$$

and therefore the proof of Theorem 1 is completed provided we verify the statements of Proposition 8 and Theorem 9.

5. The part $|\xi| \leqslant 1$: proof of Proposition 8

It is crucial to realise that as $a_0(x,\xi)$ has compact support in the ξ variable, we may write T_{a_0} as

$$T_{a_0} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi} a_0(x,\xi) f(y) dy d\xi,$$

as the double integral is absolutely convergent. Denoting by K_0 the kernel of T_{a_0},

$$K_0(x,z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{iz\cdot\xi} a_0(x,\xi) d\xi,$$

we may write

$$T_{a_0} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_0(x, x-y) f(y) dy,$$

so T_{a_0} may be interpreted as the convolution of the function $K(x,\cdot)$ with f evaluated at the point x and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{a_0} f(x)|^2 w(x) dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |K_0(x,z)||f(x-z)| dz \Big)^2 w(x) dx.$$

We split the range of integration for the inner integral in two parts, $|z| \leqslant 1$ and $|z| \geqslant 1$. For the first term, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Plancherel's theorem and the estimates on a_0 give

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\int_{|z|\leqslant 1} |K_0(x,z)||f(x-z)| dz \Big)^2 &\leqslant \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |K_0(x,z)|^2 dz \Big) \Big(\int_{|z|\leqslant 1} |f(x-z)|^2 dz \Big) \\
&\lesssim \Big(\int_{|\xi|\leqslant 2} |a_0(x,\xi)|^2 d\xi \Big) \Big(\int_{|z|\leqslant 1} |f(x-z)|^2 dz \Big) \\
&\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f(x-z)|^2 \frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^L} dz.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\int_{|z|\geqslant 1}|K_0(x,z)||f(x-z)|dz\Big)^2 &\leqslant \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|K_0(x,z)|^2|z|^{2\sigma}dz\Big)\Big(\int_{|z|\geqslant 1}\frac{1}{|z|^{2L}}|f(x-z)|^2dz\Big)\\ &\leqslant \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{|\sigma|=L}|z^\sigma K_0(x,z)|^2dz\Big)\Big(\int_{|z|\geqslant 1}\frac{1}{|z|^{2L}}|f(x-z)|^2dz\Big)\\ &\lesssim \Big(\int_{|\xi|\leqslant 2}\sum_{|\sigma|=L}|D_\xi^\sigma a_0(x,\xi)|^2d\xi\Big)\Big(\int_{|z|\geqslant 1}\frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^L}|f(x-z)|^2dz\Big)\\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f(x-z)|^2\frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^L}dz,\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma\in\mathbb{N}^d$ is a multi-index of order L. Putting things together and setting $\Psi^{(2L)}(y)=(1+|y|^2)^{-L}$, Fubini's theorem gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|T_{a_0}f(x)|^2w(x)dx\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f(x-z)|^2\frac{1}{(1+|z|^2)^L}dzw(x)dx=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f(z)|^2\Psi^{(2L)}*w(z).$$

Proposition 8 follows from noting that $\Psi^{(2L)}*w\lesssim A_1^*w$ for $L>d/2$.

6. The dyadic pieces in $|\xi|\geqslant 1$: Proof of Theorem 9

By analogy with the proof provided in [33] for the L^2-boundedness of the symbol classes $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$, with $0\leqslant\rho<1$, we reduce Theorem 9 to a similar statement for the symbol classes $S^0_{0,0}$. As we shall see, this is achieved using Bessel potentials and an elementary scaling argument. For the proof of the weighted inequality for the class $S^0_{0,0}$ we perform an equally spaced decomposition and make an application of the Cotlar–Stein almost orthogonality principle.

6.1. Reduction to the symbol classes $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$.

It is enough to prove the following version of Theorem 9 for the symbol classes $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$.

Proposition 10. *Let $a\in S^0_{\rho,\rho}$, where $0\leqslant\rho\leqslant 1$. Let f be a function such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d:|\xi|\sim R\}$ with $R\geqslant 1$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|T_af|^2w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^2\mathcal{A}_{\rho,0,R}w$$

uniformly in $R\geqslant 1$.

Theorem 9 follows from the above proposition via the following observation. Let J_m denote the Bessel potential of order m, that is $\widehat{J_mf}(\xi)=(1+|\xi|^2)^{m/2}\widehat{f}(\xi)$. Then

$$T_af(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}e^{ix\cdot\xi}a(x,\xi)(1+|\xi|^2)^{m/2}(1+|\xi|^2)^{-m/2}\widehat{f}(\xi)d\xi=T_{\widetilde{a}}(J_mf)(x),$$

where $\widetilde{a}(x,\xi)=a(x,\xi)(1+|\xi|^2)^{-m/2}\in S^0_{\rho,\rho}$. By Proposition 10

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|T_af|^2w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|T_{\widetilde{a}}(J_mf)|^2w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|J_mf|^2\mathcal{A}_{\rho,0,R}w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^2R^{2m}\Psi_R^{(L)}*\mathcal{A}_{\rho,0,R}w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^2M\mathcal{A}_{\rho,m,R}w,$$

where $\Psi_R^{(L)}(x):=\frac{R^d}{(1+R^2|x|^2)^{L/2}}$ with $L>d$. The penultimate inequality here follows from the elementary inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|J_mf|^2w\lesssim\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|f|^2R^{2m}\Psi_R^{(L)}*w,$$

which holds for any $L>d$, any weight w, and functions f such that $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})\subseteq\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d:|\xi|\sim R\}$ with $R\geqslant 1$.

6.2. **Reduction to the symbol classes $S^0_{0,0}$.** The goal now is to prove Proposition 10, that is, the special case of Theorem 9 for the symbol classes $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$. We shall see that, thanks to an elementary scaling argument, this reduces itself to the following specific case for the symbol class $S^0_{0,0}$.

Proposition 11. *Let $a \in S^0_{0,0}$. Then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \mathcal{A}w,$$

where $\mathcal{A}w := \Psi^{(N_0)} * \widetilde{w}$, $\widetilde{w}(x) := \sup_{|y-x|\leqslant 1} w(y)$ and $\Psi^{(N_0)}(x) = \frac{1}{(1+|x|^2)^{N_0/2}}$ with $N_0 > d$.

To deduce Proposition 10 from this, let φ be a smooth function such that $\widehat{\varphi}$ equals 1 in $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\xi| \sim 1\}$ and has compact Fourier support in a slightly enlargement of it, and let φ_R be defined by $\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi) := \widehat{\varphi}(R^{-1}\xi)$. The Fourier support properties of f allows us to write the reproducing formula $\widehat{f} = \widehat{f}\widehat{\varphi}_R$. We may then replace the symbol $a(x,\xi)$ by $a(x,\xi)\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi)$, which belongs to the class $S^0_{\rho,\rho}$ uniformly in R. For ease of notation, we shall denote the product symbol $a(x,\xi)\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi)$ by $a(x,\xi)$, but assuming that $a(x,\xi)$ is supported in $\{|\xi| \sim R\}$. Let

$$\widetilde{a}(x,\xi) := a(R^{-\rho}x, R^{\rho}\xi).$$

It is easy to verify from the differential inequalities (1), and the support property of $a(x,\xi)$, that the new symbol $\widetilde{a}$ belongs to the class $S^0_{0,0}$ uniformly in R; note that $\widetilde{a}$ is ξ-supported in an annulus of width $O(R^{1-\rho})$.

The change of variables $x \mapsto R^{-\rho}x$, $\xi \mapsto R^{\rho}\xi$ together with Proposition 11 lead to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 w = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_{\widetilde{a}} f_R|^2 w_R \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_R|^2 \mathcal{A}w_R$$

for functions f such that $\mathrm{supp}(\widehat{f}) \subseteq \{|\xi| \sim R\}$, where

$$w_R(x) := w(R^{-\rho}x)R^{-\rho d}$$

and

$$\widehat{f_R}(\xi) := \widehat{f}(R^{\rho}\xi)R^{\rho d}.$$

Proposition 10 now follows from noting that

$$\mathcal{A}w_R(R^{\rho}x)R^{\rho d} = \mathcal{A}_{\rho,0,R}w(x),$$

which is a consequence of the definitions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\rho,0,R}$, along with an elementary scaling argument.

We briefly compare Proposition 11 with Theorem 1 for the specific case of the symbol class $S^0_{0,0}$. In contrast with $\mathcal{M}_{0,0}$, the operator $\mathcal{A}$ fails to be bounded in any Lebesgue space, making Proposition 11 not as interesting on its own. Our method to turn it into a bounded maximal operator consists of smoothing out the weight w by a suitable average, in the spirit of (13). As explained in Section 4, this may be done after a first dyadic frequency decomposition of the operator $T_a f$.

6.3. **The symbol class $S^0_{0,0}$: proof of Proposition 11.** In this section we assume that $a \in S^0_{0,0}$. We first observe that the weight w is pointwise controlled by $\mathcal{A}w$. This is contained in the following lemma, which we borrow from [3]; see [4] for the origins of this. Its short proof is included for completeness.

Lemma 12 ([3, 4])**.** $w \lesssim \mathcal{A}w$.

Proof. It is trivial to observe that $w \leqslant \widetilde{w}$, so we only need to show $\widetilde{w} \lesssim \mathcal{A}w$. By translation invariance, it is enough to see that

$$\widetilde{w}(0) \lesssim \mathcal{A}w(0).$$

As $\widetilde{w} \geqslant 0$ and $\Psi^{(N_0)}(y) \gtrsim 1$ for $|y| \leqslant 1$,

$$\mathcal{A}w(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{N_0/2}} \widetilde{w}(y)dy \gtrsim \int_{|y|\leqslant 1} \widetilde{w}(y)dy.$$

Let $B_1, \dots, B_{2^d}$ be the intersections of the unit ball with the 2^d coordinate hyperoctants of $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is enough to show that there exists $\ell^* \in \{1, \dots, 2^d\}$ such that $\widetilde{w}(y) \geqslant \widetilde{w}(0)$ for all $y \in B_{\ell *}$, as then

$$\mathcal{A}\widetilde{w}(0) \gtrsim \int_{|y|\leqslant 1} \widetilde{w}(y)dy = \int_{B_{\ell *}} \widetilde{w}(y)dy + \sum_{\ell \neq \ell *} \int_{B_\ell} \widetilde{w}(y)dy \geqslant |B_{\ell *}|\widetilde{w}(0) \gtrsim \widetilde{w}(0),$$

which would conclude the proof. We prove our claim by contradiction. Suppose that for each $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2^d$ there exist $y_\ell \in B_\ell$ such that $\widetilde{w}(y_\ell) < \widetilde{w}(0)$. By the definition of $\widetilde{w}$,

$$\sup_{|z-y_\ell|\leqslant 1} w(z) < \widetilde{w}(0) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant 2^d.$$

As

$$\{|z| \leqslant 1\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{2^d} \{|z - y_\ell| \leqslant 1\},$$

we have

$$\widetilde{w}(0) = \sup_{|z|\leqslant 1} w(z) \leqslant \sup_{\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{2^d}\{|z-y_\ell|\leqslant 1\}} w(z) = \max_{1\leqslant \ell \leqslant 2^d} \sup_{|z-y_\ell|\leqslant 1} w(z) < \max_{1\leqslant \ell\leqslant 2^d} \widetilde{w}(0) = \widetilde{w}(0),$$

which is of course a contradiction. □

The above lemma reduces the proof of Proposition 11 to the weighted inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |T_a f|^2 \mathcal{A}w \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \mathcal{A}w. \tag{14}$$

Defining the operator $Sf := T_a((\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2} f)(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}$, it is enough to show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |Sf|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f|^2 \tag{15}$$

with bounds independent of w; (14) just follows by taking $f = (\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2} f$ in (15). Observe first that $(\mathcal{A}w)^\ell$ is a well-defined function for any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, as $\mathcal{A}w > 0$. Also, the operator S is well-defined for $f \in \mathcal{S}$; this is due to the fact that any power of $\mathcal{A}w$ has polynomial growth, as well as all its derivatives, see the forthcoming Lemma 13. Leibniz's formula ensures then that $(\mathcal{A}w)^\ell f \in \mathcal{S}$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, and that S maps $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 13. *For any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$,*

$$|D^\gamma (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x)| \lesssim (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|^2)^{N_0|\ell|/2} (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(0).$$

Proof. From the trivial fact that $|D^\gamma \Psi^{(N_0)}(x)| \lesssim \Psi^{(N_0)}(x)$ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, by definition of $\mathcal{A}$ we have

$$|D^\gamma \mathcal{A}w(x)| \leqslant |D^\gamma \Psi^{(N_0)}| * \widetilde{w}(x) \lesssim \Psi^{(N_0)} * \widetilde{w}(x) = \mathcal{A}w(x),$$

as $\widetilde{w} \geqslant 0$. The chain rule quickly reveals

$$|D^\gamma (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x)| \lesssim (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x).$$

For the second inequality, by Lemma 15 in Appendix A, one has

$$\mathcal{A}w(0) \frac{1}{(1 + |x|^2)^{N_0/2}} \lesssim \mathcal{A}w(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|^2)^{N_0/2} \mathcal{A}w(0).$$

Then, if $\ell > 0$, $(\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|^2)^{N_0 \ell/2} \mathcal{A}w(0)$, and if $\ell < 0$, $(\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(x) \lesssim (1 + |x|^2)^{N_0|\ell|/2} (\mathcal{A}w)^\ell(0)$, which concludes the proof. □

We shall prove the L^2-boundedness of the operator S from an application of the Cotlar–Stein principle to a suitable family of operators. To construct such family we introduce the following partition of unity. Let ψ be a smooth, nonnegative function supported in the unit cube $Q = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x_j| \leqslant 1\}$ and such that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(x - i) = 1, \tag{16}$$

and let $a_{\mathbf{i}}(x,\xi) = a(x,\xi)\psi(x-i)\psi(\xi-i')$, where $\mathbf{i}=(i,i')$. Then

$$a = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}} a_{\mathbf{i}}.$$

This gives a decomposition of the space associated to the ξ variable into balls of radius $O(1)$. Note that in the passage of rescaling the symbol class $S^0_{0,0}$ into $S^0_{1-\alpha,1-\alpha}$, this amounts to a decomposition of the dyadic annulus $\{|\xi|\sim R\}$ into $O(R^{\alpha d})$ balls of radius $O(R^{1-\alpha})$; this would correspond to the prototypical example of the α-subdyadic decomposition aforementioned in Section 2.[4]

This decomposition allows us to write the operator S as

$$Sf = \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}} S_{\mathbf{i}} f,$$

where $S_{\mathbf{i}} f = T_{a_{\mathbf{i}}}((\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2} f)(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}$. We aim to apply Lemma 6 to the family of operators $\{S_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}}$. To this end we need to establish

$$\|S^*_{\mathbf{i}} S_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim c(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})^2$$

and

$$\|S_{\mathbf{i}} S^*_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim c(\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j})^2$$

for a family of constants $\{c(\mathbf{i})\}_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}}$ such that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}} c(\mathbf{i}) < \infty.$$

Observe that $S^*_{\mathbf{i}} f = (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2} T^*_{a_{\mathbf{i}}}((\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2} f)$, where

$$T^*_{a_{\mathbf{i}}} g(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(y-z)}\overline{a}_{\mathbf{i}}(z,\xi) g(z) d\xi dz$$

is a well-defined operator that maps $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{S}$. The decomposition of the x variable via (16) ensures the kernel of the operator $S^*_{\mathbf{i}} S_{\mathbf{j}}$ to be well defined; also the symmetric role of the x and ξ variables in $a(x,\xi)\in S^0_{0,0}$ suggests such a decomposition in the x variable.

6.3.1. *The L^2-boundedness of $S^*_i S_j$.* The operator $S^*_{\mathbf{i}} S_{\mathbf{j}}$ may be realised as

$$\begin{aligned} S^*_{\mathbf{i}}(S_{\mathbf{j}} f)(x) &= (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x) T^*_{a_{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{A}w\; T_{a_{\mathbf{j}}}((\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2} f))(x) \\ &= (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) f(z)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} \overline{a_{\mathbf{i}}}(y,\xi) a_{\mathbf{j}}(y,\eta)\mathcal{A}w(y) dy d\eta d\xi;$$

observe that this kernel is well-defined by the support properties of $a_{\mathbf{i}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{j}}$. Note that if $i-j\notin Q$, then $K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}} = 0$.

Integrating by parts in $K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}$, after making use of the identities

$$(I-\Delta_y)^{N_1} e^{iy\cdot(\eta-\xi)} = (1+|\xi-\eta|^2)^{N_1} e^{iy\cdot(\eta-\xi)},$$

$$(I-\Delta_\eta)^{N_2} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} = (1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)}$$

and

$$(I-\Delta_\xi)^{N_3} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} = (1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3} e^{i\eta\cdot(x-y)},$$

leads to

$$K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} \frac{(I-\Delta_\xi)^{N_3}}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3}} \frac{(I-\Delta_\eta)^{N_2}}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \Big(\frac{(I-\Delta_y)^{N_1}}{(1+|\xi-\eta|^2)^{N_1}} (\overline{a_{\mathbf{i}}}(y,\xi) a_{\mathbf{j}}(y,\eta)\mathcal{A}w(y)) \Big) dy d\eta d\xi,$$

[4]The decomposition given by ψ was used in the proof of the L^2-boundedness of the class $S^0_{0,0}$ that one may find in [33] and it is a prior instance of the subdyadic analysis further developed in [4, 5, 3, 2].

for any $N_1, N_2, N_3 \geqslant 0$. Observe that $|D^\gamma \psi(y-k)| \leqslant \|\psi\|_{C^{|\gamma|}} \chi(y-k)$ for any multi-index $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, where χ is the characteristic function of Q. This, Lemma 13, and the differential inequalities satisfied by the symbols $a_{\mathbf{i}}, a_{\mathbf{j}} \in S^0_{0,0}$, allows us to deduce, after an application of Leibniz's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} |K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\chi(\xi-i')\chi(\eta-j')}{(1+|\xi-\eta|^2)^{N_1}} d\xi d\eta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{A}w(y)\chi(y-i)\chi(y-j)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}(1+|y-x|^2)^{N_3}} dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{A}w(y)\chi(y-i)\chi(y-j)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}(1+|y-x|^2)^{N_3}} dy; \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

the implicit constant here depends on finitely many C^k norms of ψ. Now we apply Schur's test to the kernel

$$\widetilde{K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}}(x,z) = K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(z)$$

with the auxiliary functions $h_1 = h_2 = (\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}$. We check first that the integral condition with respect to z is satisfied. Observe that from Lemma 14 in Appendix A, $(\mathcal{A}w) * \Psi^{(N_0)} \lesssim \mathcal{A}w$. Using this, and taking $2N_2 = 2N_3 = N_0 > d$ in (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widetilde{K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}}(x,z)| h_1(z) dz &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x)}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{A}w(y)\chi(y-i)\chi(y-j)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}(1+|y-x|^2)^{N_3}} dz dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x)}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{A}w(y)}{(1+|y-x|^2)^{N_3}} dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x)}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}}, \quad \text{if } i-j \in Q, \end{aligned}$$

for any $N_1 \geqslant 0$. On the other hand, $\widetilde{K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}} = 0$ if $i - j \notin Q$, so combining both cases,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widetilde{K_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}}(x,z)| h_1(z) dz \lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x)}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_1}},$$

for any $N_1 \geqslant 0$. As the integral condition with respect to the x variable is symmetric, Lemma 7 yields

$$\|S_{\mathbf{i}}^* S_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_1}} \tag{18}$$

for any $N_1 \geqslant 0$. The constant $c(\mathbf{i}) = (1+|\mathbf{i}|^2)^{-N_1/2}$ will be sufficient for an application of the Cotlar–Stein lemma.

6.3.2. *The L^2-boundedness of $S_i S_j^*$.* Our goal now is to see that $\|S_{\mathbf{i}} S_{\mathbf{j}}^*\|_{2\to 2}$ also satisfies the bound (18). The operator $S_{\mathbf{i}} S_{\mathbf{j}}^*$ may be realised as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathbf{i}}(S_{\mathbf{j}}^* f)(x) &= (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y) T_{a_{\mathbf{j}}}^*((\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2} f)(y) \\ &= (\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} a_{\mathbf{i}}(x,\xi)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y) T_{a_{\mathbf{j}}}^*(f(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2})(y)\psi(y-k) dy d\xi \\ &= (\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) f(z) (\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}$ is taken to be the formal sum

$$L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} L^k_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) \tag{19}$$

and

$$L^k_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} a_{\mathbf{i}}(x,\xi)\overline{a_{\mathbf{j}}}(z,\eta)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)\psi(y-k) dy d\xi d\eta.$$

Observe that, a priori, the formal sum

$$L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} L^k_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)} e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} a_{\mathbf{i}}(x,\xi)\overline{a_{\mathbf{j}}}(z,\eta)(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y) dy d\xi d\eta,$$

may not be well-defined, as the triple integral in the right hand side does not necessarily converge absolutely. For this reason, we introduce the partition of unity (16) in the y variable; the integral that defines $L^k_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}$ is now absolutely convergent. Our analysis below shows, in particular, that such sum is finite.

Again, integration by parts with respect to y, η, ξ gives

$$L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\xi\cdot(x-y)}e^{i\eta\cdot(y-z)} \frac{(I-\Delta_\xi)^{N_3}}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3}} \frac{(I-\Delta_\eta)^{N_2}}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \Big(\frac{a_{\mathbf{i}}(x,\xi)\overline{a_{\mathbf{j}}}(z,\eta)}{(1+|\eta-\xi|^2)^{N_1}}\Big)\times$$
$$\times (I-\Delta_y)^{N_1}\big((\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)\psi(y-k)\big)dyd\xi d\eta,$$

for any $N_1, N_2, N_3 \geqslant 0$, and the same observations as in the previous case allows us to deduce, after an application of Leibniz's formula,

$$|L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)| \lesssim \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\chi(x-i)\chi(\xi-i')}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(\eta-j')}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)\chi(y-k)}{(1+|\eta-\xi|^2)^{N_1}} dyd\xi d\eta.$$

As the functions $\{\chi(\cdot-k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ have bounded overlap, we may sum in the k variable and

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\chi(\xi-i')\chi(\eta-j')}{(1+|\eta-\xi|^2)^{N_1}} d\xi d\eta \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3}} dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_3}} dy. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The integration in the y variable is finite, so the sum taken in the definition of $L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}$ in (19) is well defined. In particular, for $N_2 = N_3 > N_0 + d$, it is possible to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dzdy \lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x)}{(1+|i-j|^2)^{N_2/2}}. \tag{21}$$

As the role of the variables x and z is symmetric here, the same follows with $(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x)$ replaced by $(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(z)$ in the right hand side of (21).

Assuming the estimate (21) is true, one may successfully apply Schur's test to the kernel

$$\widetilde{L}_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z) = L_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x)(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(z)$$

with auxiliary functions $h_1 = h_2 = (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}$. Using (20) and (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widetilde{L}_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(x,z)|h_1(z)dz &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x)}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dydz \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{1/2}(x)}{(1+|i'-j'|^2)^{N_1}} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x)}{(1+|i-j|)^{N_2/2}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1/2}(x)}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_2/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $N_2 > N_0 + d$; the last inequality follows from the triangle inequality and taking $N_1 = N_2/2$. As the integral condition with respect to the x variable is symmetric, an application of Lemma 7 yields

$$\|S_{\mathbf{i}}S_{\mathbf{j}}^*\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_2/2}}$$

for any $N_2 > N_0 + d$.

6.3.3. *The L^2-boundedness of S.* We just saw that the family of operators $\{S_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}}$ satisfies the bounds

$$\|S_{\mathbf{i}}^*S_{\mathbf{j}}\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_1}}, \tag{22}$$

for any $N_1 \geqslant 0$, and

$$\|S_{\mathbf{i}}S_{\mathbf{j}}^*\|_{2\to 2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}|^2)^{N_2/2}}$$

for any $N_2 > N_0 + d$. Taking $N_1 = N_2/2$ in (22) and noting that the series

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}} \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}|^2)^{N_2/4}} < \infty$$

for $N_2/2 > 2d$, an application of the Cotlar–Stein almost orthogonality principle (Lemma 6) to the family of operators $\{S_{\mathbf{i}}\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}}$ ensures that

$$\|S\|_{2\to 2} \leqslant \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\mathbb{Z}^{2d}} \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{i}|^2)^{N_2/4}} < \infty,$$

provided $N_2 > \max\{N_0 + d, 4d\}$. As we may choose N_2 as large as we please, the estimate (15) follows. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1, provided the estimate (21) is shown to be true.

6.3.4. *The validity of the estimate* (21). At this stage we are only left with proving (21), that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dzdy \lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x)}{(1+|i-j|^2)^{N_2/2}}.$$

To this end, we divide the range for the y-integration into two half-spaces, H_x and H_z, that contain the points x and z respectively and that are the result of splitting $\mathbb{R}^d$ by a hyperplane perpendicular to the line segment joining x and z at its midpoint. Note that for $y \in H_x$, $|y-z| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}|x-z|$, so

$$\frac{1}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \leqslant \frac{2^{2N_2}}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{H_x} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dydz &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2}} dz \int_{H_x} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|i-j|^2)^{N_2/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2/2}} dy.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $y \in H_z$, $|x-y| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}|x-z|$, so

$$\frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} \leqslant \frac{2^{2N_2}}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2}}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{H_z} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dydz \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{H_z} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2}} dydz.$$

By the elementary inequality

$$\frac{1}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2/2}} \frac{1}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2/2}},$$

which is a simple consequence of the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{H_z} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2}} dydz &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N_2/2}} dz \int_{H_z} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2/2}} dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|i-j|^2)^{N_2/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2/2}} dy.\end{aligned}$$

Putting both estimates together,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N_2}} \frac{\chi(z-j)\chi(x-i)}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_2}} dzdy \lesssim \frac{(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1} * \Psi^{(N_2)}(x)}{(1+|i-j|^2)^{N_2/2}},$$

so the inequality (21) is satisfied if

$$(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1} * \Psi^{(N_2)}(x) \lesssim (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x).$$

As $\widetilde{w} \geqslant 0$, by Lemma 15,

$$\Psi^{(N_0)} * \widetilde{w}(x) \geqslant \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N_0/2}} \Psi^{(N_0)} * \widetilde{w}(y),$$

so by definition of $\mathcal{A}w$,

$$(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x) \leqslant (1+|x-y|^2)^{N_0/2} (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(y);$$

in particular

$$(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x-y) \leqslant (1+|y|^2)^{N_0/2} (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{A}w)^{-1} * \Psi^{(N_2)}(x) &= \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{l+[0,1]^d} (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x-y)\Psi^{(N_2)}(y)dy \\ &\leqslant \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x) \int_{l+[0,1]^d} (1+|y|^2)^{(N_0-N_2)/2}dy \\ &\lesssim (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x) \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} (1+|l|^2)^{(N_0-N_2)/2} \\ &\lesssim (\mathcal{A}w)^{-1}(x),\end{aligned}$$

provided $N_2 > N_0 + d$, and the inequality (21) follows.

Appendix A. Properties of $\Psi^{(N)}$

Here we briefly recall some elementary properties of the function $\Psi^{(N)}(x) := \frac{1}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}}$ to which we appealed to in our proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 14. *Let $N > d$. Then $\Psi^{(N)} * \Psi^{(N)} \lesssim \Psi^{(N)}$.*

Proof. We need to show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{(1+|y-x|^2)^{N/2}} \frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{N/2}} dy \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. To this end, we divide $\mathbb{R}^d$ into two half-spaces H_x and H_0 , that contain the points x and 0 respectively and that are the result of splitting $\mathbb{R}^d$ by a hyperplane perpendicular to the line segment joining x and the origin 0 at its midpoint. If $y \in H_x$, then $|y| \geqslant |x|/2$ and

$$\frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{N/2}} \leqslant \frac{2^N}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{H_x} \frac{1}{(1+|y-x|^2)^{N/2}} \frac{1}{(1+|y|^2)^{N/2}} dy \leqslant \frac{2^N}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}} \int_{H_x} \frac{1}{(1+|y-x|^2)^{N/2}} dy \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+|x|^2)^{N/2}}.$$

If $y \in H_0$, we proceed similarly, as now $|y-x| \geqslant |x|/2$. □

Lemma 15. *For $w \geqslant 0$,*

$$w * \Psi^{(N)}(x) \gtrsim \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N/2}} w * \Psi^{(N)}(y).$$

Proof. The triangle inequality quickly reveals that $(1+|x|^2)^{-N/2} \gtrsim (1+|x-y|^2)^{-N/2}(1+|y|^2)^{-N/2}$ for any $N \geqslant 0$. Then, as $w \geqslant 0$,

$$\frac{w(z)}{(1+|x-z|^2)^{N/2}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|^2)^{N/2}} \frac{w(z)}{(1+|y-z|^2)^{N/2}},$$

just by replacing $x \mapsto x-z$, $y \mapsto y-z$. The result follows integrating with respect to the z variable. □

Appendix B. Symbolic calculus

This appendix is devoted to providing a proof of Theorem 5, which is a very specific quantitative version of the symbolic calculus in Hörmander [19]. As is mentioned in Section 3.2, the order of the error symbol $e^N \in S^{m-N(1-\delta)+d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}_{\rho,\delta}$ is not necessarily sharp here, but it naturally arises from our proof. Nevertheless, such an order is admissible for our purposes, as one may choose N large enough so that e^N is of sufficiently large negative order. Our proof follows the same structure as that given in Stein [33] for the standard symbol classes S^m.

To justify our computations, we technically should replace a by a_ε, where $a_\varepsilon(x,\xi) = a(x,\xi)\psi(\varepsilon x, \varepsilon\xi)$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\psi(0,0) = 1$. The symbol a_ε, which has compact support, satisfies the same differential inequalities as a uniformly in $0 < \varepsilon \leqslant 1$. As our estimates will be independent of ε, the passage to the limit when $\varepsilon \to 0$ gives the desired result; we refer to [33] for these standard details. Such considerations allow us to suppress the dependence on ε in what follows.

Observe that we may write

$$T_{\widehat{\varphi}_R}(T_a f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} c(x,\xi) e^{i(x-z)\cdot\xi} f(z) dz d\xi,$$

where

$$c(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{\varphi}_R(\eta) a(y,\xi) e^{i(x-y)\cdot(\eta-\xi)} dy d\eta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi+\eta)\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi) e^{ix\cdot\eta} d\eta,$$

and $\widehat{a}$ denotes Fourier transform with respect to the x variable. We first obtain an estimate depending on the size of the support of a; such dependence will be later removed in the second part of the proof.

B.1. **Assuming $a(x,\xi)$ has compact support in the x-variable.** Integrating by parts,

$$\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{e^{ix\cdot\eta}}{(1+|\eta|^2)^M}(I-\Delta_x)^M a(x,\xi) dx,$$

so

$$|\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)| \lesssim (1+|\eta|)^{-2M}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M\delta}, \tag{23}$$

for any $M \geqslant 0$; the implicit constant above depends on the size of the support of a in the x variable. For $\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi+\eta)$ we use Taylor's formula around the point ξ,

$$\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi+\eta) = \sum_{|\gamma|<N} \frac{1}{\gamma!}\partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi)\eta^\gamma + \mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta),$$

where $\mathfrak{R}_N$ is the remainder in Taylor's theorem and is bounded by

$$|\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim \max_{|\gamma|=N}\max_{\zeta} |\partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{\varphi}_R(\zeta)||\eta|^N,$$

where the maximum in ζ is taken on the line segment joining ξ to $\xi+\eta$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} c(x,\xi) &= \sum_{|\gamma|<N}\frac{1}{\gamma!}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\partial_\xi^\gamma\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi)\eta^\gamma\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)e^{ix\cdot\eta}d\eta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)e^{ix\cdot\eta}d\eta \\ &= \sum_{|\gamma|<N}\frac{i^{-|\gamma|}}{\gamma!}\partial_\xi^\gamma\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi)\partial_x^\gamma a(x,\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)e^{ix\cdot\eta}d\eta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$e^N(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)e^{ix\cdot\eta}d\eta.$$

We need to show that the $e^N \in S^{m-N(1-\delta)+d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}_{\rho,\delta}$ and satisfies the differential inequalities (10).

Observe that, for γ such that $|\gamma| = N$,

$$\partial_\xi^\gamma\widehat{\varphi}_R(\zeta) = R^{-N}(\partial_\xi^\gamma\widehat{\varphi})(R^{-1}\zeta) \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\zeta|)^{-N+\epsilon},$$

as the support condition on $\widehat{\varphi}$ ensures $|\zeta| \sim R \sim |\zeta|+1$, since $R > 1$. This leads to the following estimates for the remainder,

$$|\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}|\eta|^N(1+|\xi|)^{-N+\epsilon} \quad \text{for} \quad |\xi| \geqslant 2|\eta|,$$

and

$$|\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}|\eta|^N \quad \text{for} \quad |\xi| \leqslant 2|\eta|,$$

as $N \geqslant \epsilon$. Using the estimate (23) in the form

$$|\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)| \lesssim (1+|\eta|)^{-2M_1}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_1\delta} \quad \text{for} \quad |\xi| \geqslant 2|\eta|,$$

and

$$|\widehat{a}(\eta,\xi)| \lesssim (1+|\eta|)^{-2M_2}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_2\delta} \quad \text{for} \quad |\xi| \leqslant 2|\eta|,$$

where $M_1, M_2 \geqslant 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|e^N(x,\xi)| &\lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_1\delta-N+\epsilon}\int_{|\xi|\geqslant 2|\eta|}(1+|\eta|)^{-2M_1}|\eta|^N d\eta \\ &\quad + R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_2\delta}\int_{|\xi|\leqslant 2|\eta|}(1+|\eta|)^{-2M_2}|\eta|^N d\eta \\ &\lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_1\delta-N+\epsilon} + R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2M_2\delta-2M_2+N+d}\end{aligned}$$

provided $-2M_1+N+d<0$ and $-2M_2+N+d<0$. Choosing

$$M_1 = (N+d+\kappa)/2$$

and

$$M_2 = \frac{2N+d(1-\delta)-\kappa\delta-\epsilon-N\delta}{2(1-\delta)},$$

which clearly satisfies the condition $-2M_2+N+d<0$, as $N>\epsilon+\kappa\delta$, one has

$$|e^N(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-N(1-\delta)+d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}.$$

In view of the definitions of the symbols c and e^N, the use of the Leibniz formula and the condition $\rho \leqslant 1$ allows one, by the same arguments as above, to deduce the differential inequalities (10) for all multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$.

B.2. **The case of general $a(x,\xi)$.** Observe that it suffices to prove the differential inequalities (10) for x near an arbitrary but fixed point x_0; in particular we prove them for x such that $|x-x_0|\leqslant 1/2$, with bounds independent of x_0. To this end, let θ be a smooth function which equals 1 on $|y-x_0|\leqslant 1$ and supported in $|y-x_0|\leqslant 2$, and write $a=\theta a+(1-\theta)a = a_1+a_2$. For a_1, one may argue as before and write

$$c_1(x,\xi) = \sum_{|\gamma|<N}\frac{i^{-|\gamma|}}{\gamma!}(\partial_\xi^\gamma \widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi))(\partial_x^\gamma a_1(x,\xi)) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mathfrak{R}_N(\xi,\eta)\widehat{a}_1(\eta,\xi)e^{ix\cdot\eta}d\eta.$$

As $a_1 = a$ for $|x-x_0|\leqslant 1/2$ and the size of the support of a_1 in the x variable is constant and independent of x_0, the previous argument reveals that the symbol

$$e_1^N(x,\xi) := c_1(x,\xi) - \sum_{|\gamma|<N}\frac{i^{-|\gamma|}}{\gamma!}(\partial_\xi^\gamma\widehat{\varphi}_R(\xi))(\partial_x^\gamma a(x,\xi))$$

satisfies the differential inequalities (10) for $|x-x_0|\leqslant 1/2$, with bounds independent of x_0. As

$$|e^N(x,\xi)| \leqslant |e_1^N(x,\xi)| + |c_2(x,\xi)|,$$

where c_2 is the symbol of $T_{\widehat{\varphi}_R}\circ T_{a_2}$, it is enough to show that c_2 satisfies the same estimates as e_1^N. Indeed, we will show that for $|x-x_0|\leqslant 1/2$,

$$|c_2(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-\bar{N}}$$

for any $\bar{N}\geqslant 0$; the proof then follows by taking

$$\bar{N} = N(1-\delta) - d\delta - \kappa\delta - \epsilon,$$

which is nonnegative for $N > \frac{d\delta+\kappa\delta+\epsilon}{1-\delta}$.

Recall that

$$c_2(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\widehat{\varphi}_R(\eta)a_2(y,\xi)e^{i(x-y)\cdot(\eta-\xi)}dyd\eta.$$

Integrating by parts with respect to the η variable,

$$c_2(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{\Delta_\eta^{N_1}\widehat{\varphi}_R(\eta)}{|x-y|^{2N_1}}a_2(y,\xi)e^{i(x-y)\cdot(\eta-\xi)}dyd\eta,$$

which is a convergent integral, as for $|x-x_0|\leqslant 1/2$ and $|y-x_0|\geqslant 1$, we have $|x-y|\geqslant 1/2$. Integrating by parts with respect to the y variable,

$$c_2(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{\Delta_\eta^{N_1}\widehat{\varphi}_R(\eta)}{(1+|\eta-\xi|^2)^{N_2}}(I-\Delta_y)^{N_2}\Big(\frac{a_2(y,\xi)}{|x-y|^{2N_1}}\Big)e^{i(x-y)\cdot(\eta-\xi)}dyd\eta.$$

In view of the differential inequalities satisfied by $\widehat{\varphi}_R$ and a_2,

$$|c_2(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(1+|\eta|)^{-2N_1+\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m+2N_2\delta}}{(1+|\eta-\xi|)^{2N_2}(1+|x-y|)^{2N_1}} dy d\eta.$$

The integration in y is finite if we choose $N_1 > d/2$. The triangle inequality trivially reveals

$$\frac{1}{(1+|\eta-\xi|)^{2N_2}} \leqslant \frac{(1+|\eta|)^{2N_2}}{(1+|\xi|)^{2N_2}},$$

for any $N_2 \geqslant 0$, so

$$|c_2(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-2N_2(1-\delta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+|\eta|)^{-2N_1+2N_2+\epsilon} d\eta \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-\bar{N}},$$

provided we take $2N_2(1-\delta) = \bar{N}$ and N_1 satisfying $2N_1 - 2N_2 - \epsilon > d$, that is

$$N_1 > \frac{d+\epsilon+\bar{N}/(1-\delta)}{2}.$$

Observe that any such N_1 also satisfies the required condition $N_1 > d/2$, as $\bar{N} \geqslant 0$.

In view of the definition of c_2, the use of the Leibniz formula and of similar arguments to the ones exposed above leads one to deduce that

$$|\partial_x^\nu \partial_\xi^\sigma c_2(x,\xi)| \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}(1+|\xi|)^{m-\rho|\sigma|+\delta|\nu|-\bar{N}}$$

for any $\bar{N} \geqslant 0$ and all multi-indices $\nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{N}^d$, so we may conclude that e^N satisfies the required differential inequalities (10).

References

[1] D. Beltran. A Fefferman-Stein inequality for the Carleson operator. Preprint arXiv:1410.6085.
[2] D. Beltran and J. Bennett. Subdyadic square functions and applications to weighted harmonic analysis. Preprint arXiv:1510.01897.
[3] J. Bennett. Optimal control of singular Fourier multipliers by maximal operators. *Anal. PDE*, 7(6):1317–1338, 2014.
[4] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, F. Soria, and A. Vargas. A Stein conjecture for the circle. *Math. Ann.*, 336(3):671–695, 2006.
[5] J. Bennett and S. Harrison. Weighted norm inequalities for oscillatory integrals with finite type phases on the line. *Adv. Math.*, 229(4):2159–2183, 2012.
[6] A.-P. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt. A class of bounded pseudo-differential operators. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 69:1185–1187, 1972.
[7] A. Carbery. A weighted inequality for the maximal Bochner-Riesz operator on $\mathbf{R}^2$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 287(2):673–680, 1985.
[8] A. Carbery, E. Romera, and F. Soria. Radial weights and mixed norm inequalities for the disc multiplier. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 109(1):52–75, 1992.
[9] A. Carbery and A. Seeger. Weighted inequalities for Bochner-Riesz means in the plane. *Q. J. Math.*, 51(2):155–167, 2000.
[10] S. Chanillo and A. Torchinsky. Sharp function and weighted L^p estimates for a class of pseudodifferential operators. *Ark. Mat.*, 24(1):1–25, 1986.
[11] M. Christ. On almost everywhere convergence of Bochner-Riesz means in higher dimensions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 95(1):16–20, 1985.
[12] A. Córdoba. The Kakeya maximal function and the spherical summation multipliers. *Amer. J. Math.*, 99(1):1–22, 1977.
[13] A. Córdoba and C. Fefferman. A weighted norm inequality for singular integrals. *Studia Math.*, 57(1):97–101, 1976.
[14] A. Córdoba and K. M. Rogers. Weighted estimates for conic Fourier multipliers. *Math. Z.*, 278(1-2):431–440, 2014.
[15] F. Di Plinio and A. K. Lerner. On weighted norm inequalities for the Carleson and Walsh-Carleson operator. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 90(3):654–674, 2014.
[16] C. Fefferman. L^p bounds for pseudo-differential operators. *Israel J. Math.*, 14:413–417, 1973.
[17] C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein. Some maximal inequalities. *Amer. J. Math.*, 93:107–115, 1971.
[18] P. R. Halmos and V. S. Sunder. *Bounded integral operators on L^2 spaces*, volume 96 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1978.
[19] L. Hörmander. Pseudo-differential operators and hypoelliptic equations. In *Singular integrals (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. X, Chicago, Ill., 1966)*, pages 138–183. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1967.
[20] J. J. Kohn and L. Nirenberg. An algebra of pseudo-differential operators. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 18:269–305, 1965.
[21] M. T. Lacey. An elementary proof of the A_2 Bound. Preprint arXiv:1501.05818.
[22] S. Lee, K. M. Rogers, and A. Seeger. Improved bounds for Stein's square functions. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 104(6):1198–1234, 2012.
[23] A. K. Lerner. A simple proof of the A_2 conjecture. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (14):3159–3170, 2013.
[24] A. K. Lerner. On pointwise estimates involving sparse operators. *New York J. Math.*, 22:341–349, 2016.

[25] N. Michalowski, D. J. Rule, and W. Staubach. Weighted norm inequalities for pseudo-pseudodifferential operators defined by amplitudes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(12):4183–4209, 2010.
[26] N. Michalowski, D. J. Rule, and W. Staubach. Weighted L^p boundedness of pseudodifferential operators and applications. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 55(3):555–570, 2012.
[27] N. Miller. Weighted Sobolev spaces and pseudodifferential operators with smooth symbols. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 269(1):91–109, 1982.
[28] A. Nagel and E. M. Stein. On certain maximal functions and approach regions. *Adv. in Math.*, 54(1):83–106, 1984.
[29] C. Pérez. Weighted norm inequalities for singular integral operators. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 49(2):296–308, 1994.
[30] C. Pérez. On sufficient conditions for the boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator between weighted L^p-spaces with different weights. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 71(1):135–157, 1995.
[31] E. M. Stein. *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 30. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
[32] E. M. Stein. Some problems in harmonic analysis. In *Harmonic analysis in Euclidean spaces (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Williams Coll., Williamstown, Mass., 1978), Part 1*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXV, Part, pages 3–20. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1979.
[33] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, volume 43 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.
[34] J. M. Wilson. Weighted norm inequalities for the continuous square function. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 314(2):661–692, 1989.
[35] M. Wilson. The intrinsic square function. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 23(3):771–791, 2007.

School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

E-mail address: d.beltran@pgr.bham.ac.uk